



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LOVINGSTON, NELSON CO., VA., October 17, 1895.

Editor Virginia Law Register :

I enclose you for publication in the REGISTER a unique document, a love-letter, admitted to probate, on appeal, as a will. Is there such another case in the history of probate jurisdiction?

RO. WHITEHEAD.

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.

"In Nelson County Cir. Court, April Term 1866, Hugh W. Sheffey Presid'g:
Mary A. Goodwin Appel } Upon a motion to propound the Will of John W.
vs } Goodwin decd for probat on an appeal from the county
Mary E. Harris Appellee } court of Nelson.

It being suggested that the plaintiff in the motion has intermarried With John. W. Matthews, it is ordered that the same stand and be prosecuted in the name of John. W. Matthews and Mary. E. his Wife as plaintiffs in the motion here and as Appellees on the appeal from the judgment of the county court of Nelson county.

And thereupon this day came the parties by their attornies and the evidence on both sides being heard, it is considered by the court, that the paper writing in the words and figures following—'May the 13th 1861, Much Esteemed *M. E. H.* I take my pen in hand, for the purpose to respond to your most Welcome letter, which was received a few days since, Which Gave me Great pleasure When I perused it, you say 'though I may be absent' but not forgotten by you I hope not, though I have Vowed to you my Sentiments upon the Subject, that I was candid and sincere in What I have told you, and now I want to ——— Whether I can have the pleasure of *joying* heart and with you or not. I am not precipitate, nor would I desire your hand, if your heart did not accompany it, I *now* not in what light it may be *consider* only if I could from any motion made on it by your amible accomplishments, my happiness in this World Will in Great Measure depend upon your answer, if this does not meet your approbation, you Will please look upon me as favorable as possible for making such *Vowals*: You Say you *now* not who I May be writing to at this time, you Will See from the above whether I am or not, I must Close My imperfect ——— Nothing More at present but remain Your ever true friend until death, answer immediately as — shall be in Suspense until I am answered either by letter or verbatim—Your real admirer.

J. W. G.

P. S. If I do go to War, and Never return, you Shall have the benefit of what I leave behind to Your own disposal. J. W. Goodwin. Dont Show this '—, is proven in the hand writing of Jno. W. Goodwin deceased, that the said John. W. Goodwin at the date of said paper Writing was over the age of eighteen and under the age of twenty-one Years and that said paper writing was addressed to, and received by, the Said Mary E. then Mary E. Harris, and was in her keeping and custody until the Same was propounded for probat in the county court of

Nelson county, and that afterwards, to Wit, in the month of June, 1861, said Jno. W. Goodwin did Go to War, that is, into the Military Service, and did not return to the county of Nelson, but died in the Military Service in the Western portion of the State of Virginia in the fall of 1861: and thereupon it is considered by the court that so much of said paper writing as is in the Words following, to Wit, 'If I do Go to War and never return, you shall have the benefit of what I leave behind to your own disposal. J. W. Goodwin,' is the true last Will and testament of John W. Goodwin deceased, Sufficient to pass to the Said Mary E. the personal Estate of Said John W. Goodwin deceased, remaining at his death, and that the same be recorded as Such last Will and testament of Said John W. Goodwin deceased, and that to that extent the judgment of the county court be affirmed; and it is further considered that the costs here and in the county court be paid out the estate of Said John W. Goodwin, deceased, and by Consent of parties it is ordered that this judgment and said paper writing be certified to the county court of Nelson county for record in Said court and for further proceedings therein for administration of the Estate of Said John W. Goodwin deed, and otherwise according to the rights of the parties.

A Copy

Teste: GEO. S. STEVENS, Clk.

In the clerks office of Nelson county court August the 1st 1866. This *dockument* Was presented in said office duly certified by the clerk of the circuit court of this county, and admitted to record as the last Will and testament of John. W. Goodwin deed.

Teste: S. H. LOVING, clerk.

A Copy Teste:

W. J. KIDD clerk."

CHAMPERTY IN VERMONT.—The following letter has reference to a note in the November number of the REGISTER, p. 555, entitled "Status of Champerty in the United States," in which it was said that its existence is doubtful in Vermont:

BURLINGTON, VERMONT, November 12, 1895.

VIRGINIA LAW REGISTER,

Lynchburg, Virginia.

Gentlemen:

Champerty was doubtful in Vermont for some time, but the fact is we never have had a case come before our Supreme Court that was champertous until the case of *Hamilton v. Gray*, in the last Report, 67 Vt. 233, which fully sustains champerty at common law.

Very truly,

GEO. W. DEBERVILLE.